

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 9, 12, 19, 20 and 26 have been amended and claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been entered. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 6-44 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, 18, 22-24, 31-32 and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sawada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,810,274). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites an electronic apparatus comprising an electronic device including a body and one of at least first and second selectively interchangeable batteries coupled to the body, the first battery to supply current to said electronic device, the second battery to supply current and to provide information storage to said electronic device. Further, the second battery includes a memory unit having a built-in main memory and a detachable auxiliary memory, and the electronic device stores data in the built-in main memory and the detachable auxiliary memory. Applicants respectfully assert that Sawada fails to disclose several of these claimed features.

To review, Sawada discloses a wireless telephone set including a portable telephone unit 1 and a battery pack 2. The battery pack supplies the portable telephone unit 1 with electric power and has a removable IC card having a semiconductor memory 3 contained therein. The semiconductor memory 3 is inserted into the battery pack 2 through an opening 5. A secondary battery 9 is contained in the battery pack 2. *See Sawada, at column 3, paragraphs [0034], [0035] and [0039].* In more detail, while the portable telephone unit 1 is supplied with electric power by the secondary battery 9 of the battery pack 2 having the semiconductor memory 3 contained therein, if the battery pack 2 is removed from the portable telephone unit 1, the semiconductor memory 3 is kept supplied with electric power by the secondary battery 9 so that data recorded on the semiconductor memory 3 is not broken or lost. *See Sawada, at column 4, paragraph [0043].*

Thus, Sawada makes clear that the portable telephone unit 1, which the Examiner likens to the claimed electronic device is not paired with one of either the battery pack 2 or the secondary battery 9 as in the claimed invention in which the electronic device is paired with one of first and second selectively interchangeable batteries. Rather, the portable telephone unit 1 of Sawada may either be attached to the battery pack 2 or not. If they are not attached, since the secondary battery 9 is a component of the battery pack 2, *see id. at paragraph [0039]*, the

secondary battery 9 cannot have any connection whatsoever to the portable telephone unit 1.

In other words, while the claimed invention recites first and second selectively interchangeable batteries, the reference merely discloses a battery pack 2 and a secondary battery 9 that are virtually completely dependent upon one another.

Moreover, calling attention to the recitation that the second battery includes a memory unit having a built-in main memory and a detachable auxiliary memory, applicants note that Sawada clearly indicates that the semiconductor memory 3 is merely a component of the battery pack 2 just like the secondary battery 9. In fact, other than being part of the battery pack 2, the semiconductor memory 3 and the secondary battery 9 have no common association with each other. Further, Sawada is completely silent as to a disclosure that the secondary battery 9 includes a semiconductor memory 3 of its own and certainly not a "built-in memory and a detachable memory," as claimed. Thus, Sawada cannot be said to disclose a second battery including a memory unit having a built-in main memory and a detachable auxiliary memory as claimed.

Finally, it is noted that while Sawada discloses additional embodiments of the invention in that reference, the additional embodiments do not vary substantially with respect to the features discussed hereinabove.

Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentably distinguished from Sawada and that the rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 8, 15, 22, 31 and 44, it is noted that these claims recite substantially similar features as claim 1 and that, therefore, these rejections are also overcome for substantially similar reasons as set forth above.

Regarding the rejections of claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 18, 23, 24, 32 and 41-43, it is noted that these claims depend from claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 31 and 44, respectively, and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 2-4, 9-11, 16-17, 19-21, 25-29 and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Sawada et al. in view of Maekawa (U.S. Patent 5,490,202), and claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. in view of Maekawa and further in view of Griffith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,917,280). These rejections are respectively overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2, 9, 12, 19, 20 and 26, it is noted that these claims have been amended to include substantially similar features as that of the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, these claims are rendered patentably distinguished from Sawada.

Further, it is noted that the references to Maekawa and Griffith are not cited to, and, in fact, do not cure the defects of Sawada, as discussed above. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 5, 9, 12, 19, 20 and 26 define over any combinations of the references, and that, therefore, the rejections are overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 3, 10, 11, 16-17, 21, 25, 27-29 and 33-40, it is noted that these claims are each dependent from an independent claim that either defines over any combination of the references or is patentably distinguished from Sawada such that the secondary reference does not cure the defects of Sawada, as discussed above. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above.

Regarding the rejections of claims 4 and 5, it is noted that these claims have been cancelled and that, thus, the rejections are moot. It is further noted that a divisional application directed to these claims will be filed in due course so that continued examination of these claims can be undertaken.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 10/28/00

By: 
Howard I. Levy
Registration No. 55,378

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510